

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSIONEIVED

2

3

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

JIM IRVIN

MARC SPITZER

ACT OF 1996

CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF US WEST COMMUNI-

CATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS

4

5

6

8

7

9

11

12

10

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 1 6 2002

DOCKETED BY	/
	اسمه.
	1
	17'

2002 MAY 16 P 4: 04

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

Docket No. T-00000A-97-238

COX ARIZONA TELCOM, L.L.C.'S COMMENTS ON STAFF'S MAY 1, 2002 REPORT ON QWEST'S COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC INTEREST AND TRACK A

Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C. ("Cox") submits the following comments on Staff's May 1, 2002 Report on Qwest's Compliance with Public Interest and Track A. In general, Cox supports Staff's concerns about Qwest's Winback Tariff; however, Cox believes Staff's proposal to remedy the anticompetitive effect of the Winback Tariff is both confusing and unnecessarily complicated.

First, it is clear that the current form of the Winback Tariff is unacceptable. See Report, ¶¶ 281, 283, 389. Staff offers Qwest the option of either (i) withdrawing the existing Winback Tariff or (ii) "modifying" that tariff by filing a new version of the tariff. See Report, ¶¶ 283, 388. However, the proposed modification set forth in the Report is not clear. Is Qwest supposed to: (i) delay its winback efforts for a particular customer until after the customer has used the CLEC service for six months or (ii) simply delay offering a

¹ Although the report is titled "Final Report," the Notice of Filing suggests the May 1, 2002 report is a "Proposed Report" that will be revised to incorporate comments on that report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

winback incentive under the tariff until six months after Owest receives its 271 approval?

Regardless of what was intended, neither modification will resolve the problems created by the Winback Tariff as identified in the Report. If the former modification is correct, Qwest will still have an inappropriate anticompetitive tool because it will still have an enormous market share. Moreover, many CLECs depend on Qwest even after the initial port from Qwest to the CLEC because those CLECs use Qwest UNEs. Qwest would still have the incentive to provide bad wholesale service in order to tarnish CLEC retail service and win back those retail customers. If the latter modification was intended, Owest will still have an enormous market share six months after the 271 approval – and given its new ability to "package" services – will be pursuing former customers more aggressively than ever. Qwest also will still have the same incentive to provide poor number porting or other wholesale service to CLECs in order to tarnish the CLECs' apparent performance in the eyes of the customers.

Second, Cox submits the most simple and most effective solution is to require Owest to withdraw its current Winback Tariff. Period. Owest would be free to submit a new Winback Tariff whenever it feels it is appropriate to do so, but the Commission would be able to treat the tariff filing as it would any new tariff filing. It would retain its full ability to analyze whether the proposed tariff is in the public interest given the existing circumstances at the time of filing (market share, tariff language, etc.) without any lingering effect from statements in its 271 orders about how a such a tariff might be modified to be acceptable.

Third, Staff notes (Report, ¶ 308) that Owest has filed a Local Service Freeze ("LSF") tariff. However, the Report does not note that Cox submitted supplemental comments (filed on February 5, 2002 and February 25, 2002) related to the potential impact of such a tariff on this docket. As noted in those comments, a LSF tariff creates significant new concerns about the Public Interest element and Local Number Portability (Checklist Item 11). Cox submits that Qwest also should be required to withdraw its LSF tariff filing

1	as a condition of compliance with the Public Interest element. This condition would be
2	consistent with Staff's recently-filed testimony in the LSF tariff docket (Docket No. T-
3	01051B-02-0073).
4	
5	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED May 16, 2002.
6	Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C.
7	By: Unles att
8	Michael W. Patten
9	ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC One Arizona Center
10	400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 (602) 256-6100
11	(002) 230-0100
12	ORIGINAL and TEN (10) COPIES of the foregoing filed May 16, 2002, with:
13	Docket Control
14	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
15	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
16	COPIES of the foregoing hand-delivered
17	May 16, 2002, to:
18	Jane Rodda, Esq. ALJ, Hearing Division
19	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
20	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
21	Maureen Scott, Esq. Legal Division
22	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

23

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

23

1	Michael M. Grant, Esq.
2	Todd C. Wiley, Esq. GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
3	2575 East Camelback Road Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
4	Gena Doyscher
5	GLOBAL CROSSING LOCAL SERVICES, INC. 1221 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420
6	Penny Bewick
7	New Edge Networks. 3000 Columbia House Boulevard, Suite 106
8	Vancouver, Washington 98661
9	Richard P. Kolb ONE POINT COMMUNICATIONS
10	Two Conway Park 150 Field Drive, Suite 300
11	Lake Forest, Illinois 60045
12	Thomas H. Campbell, Esq. LEWIS & ROCA L.L.P.
13	40 North Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004
14	Thomas L. Mumaw, Esq.
15	SNELL & WILMER One Arizona Center
16	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0001
17	Scott Wakefield, Esq. RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE 2828 North Central Avenue, Suite 1200
18	Phoenix, Arizona 85004
19	Steven J. Duffy, Esq. RIDGE & ISAACSON P.C.
20	3101 North Central Avenue, Suite 1090 San Mateo, California 94404-2737
21	Kevin Chapman
22	SBC TELECOM, INC. 300 Convent Street, Room 13-Q-40
23	San Antonio, Texas 78205

Eric S. Heath, Esq.

2

23

100 Spear Street, Suite 930

San Francisco, California 94105

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.

1	Andrew D. Crain, Esq.
	II
2	QWEST CORPORATION 1081 California Street, Suite 4900
	Denver, Colorado 80202
3	Timothy Berg, Esq.
4	FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C. 3033 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913
6	Traci Grundon, Esq.
7	DAVIS WRIGHT & TREMAINE L.L.P. 2600 Century Square
	1501 Fourth Avenue Portland, Oregon 98101
8	Tornara, oregon yerer
9	Daniel Waggoner, Esq. Davis Wright & Tremaine L.L.P.
10	1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300 Portland, Oregon 97201
11	Philip A Doherty
12	545 South Prospect Street, Suite 22 Burlington, Vermont 05401-3538
13	Gary L. Lane, Esq.
14	6902 East 1 st Street, Suite 201 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
15	W. Hagood Bellinger
16	5312 Trowbridge Drive Dunwoody, Georgia 30338
17	Paul Bullis, Esq.
18	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 1275 West Washington
	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
19	Joyce Hundley, Esq.
20	Antitrust Division UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
21	1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 8000 Washington, D.C. 20530
22	()-()//
23	Klyne Malan